

## **Remarks**

Claims 1-10 are pending in the application of which claims 1-10 are rejected. By this paper, Applicant amends claims 1-4 and 7-10; cancels claims 5-6, and adds new claims 11-14. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims; however, Applicant amends the claims in order to further prosecution.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102***

#### **Rejection of claims 4-6 and 9 over Lampotang et al. (5,779,484)**

The Examiner has rejected claims 4-6 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Lampotang et al. '484. Lampotang et al. '484 teaches a pneumatic mechanism 118 for emptying the lung, and the pneumatic mechanism is attached to the upper plate 120 by a piston rod 114. Since Lampotang et al. '484 does not teach a flexible means rather it uses a rigid piston rod to connect the top plate to the pneumatic mechanism. Therefore, claim 4 as amended is not anticipated and is believed to be allowable.

Claims 5-6 are canceled.

Claim 9 is amended to clean up grammatical issues. The claim as filed included a pressure sensor being disposed at a distance from the actuator and a nozzle (throttle) upstream of the pressure sensor for neutralizing the pressure difference between the pressure sensor and the actuator. The actuator is defined with the specification as an air cushion or lung 27. The Examiner states that Lampotang et al. '484 has a mass flow controller upstream of the pressure sensor which behaves as a throttle to neutralize the pressure difference between the pressure sensor and the actuator. Lampotang et al. '484 also teaches that the pressure sensor 101 is located with the bellows 100. Since claim 9 has the pressure sensor located outside of the actuator or lung and uses a nozzle to neutralize the pressure difference, it is not anticipated by Lampotang et al. '484, and is believed to be allowable.

***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103***

**Rejection of claims 1-3 over Lampotang et al. (5,779,484) in view of Owens et al. (6,910,896)**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lampotang et al. '484 in view of Owen et al. '896.

Claim 1 requires a means for "pulling down the chest skin providing an external visible depression of the skin." The Examiner states that Owens et al. '896 teaches such an inhalation mechanism and references column 1, lines 37-40, which discusses his Figure 1. This text and Figure 1 of Owens et al. '896 discusses the actual human body inhalation process and not the invention of Owens et al. '896. Since Owens et al. '896 does not each an artificial inhalation mechanism with pulling down of chest skin, the combination of references would not be obvious, and Claim 1 is nonobvious.

Claim 2-3 depend from claim 1 and are therefore in allowance with respect to Claim 1.

**Rejection of claims 7-8 over Lampotang et al. (5,779,484) in view of Smith-Whitley et al. (6,077,083)**

The Examiner has rejected claims 7-8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lampotang et al. '484 in view of Smith-Whitley et al. '083.

Claim 7 is amended and requires two actuators on the right and left backside of the torso for simulation of muscle activity. The Examiner states that Smith-Whitley et al. '083 teaches a "doll where the torso comprises at least two actuators . . . arranged on the right and left sides, respectively, or the backside of the torso," and that the actuators have modes for simulation of muscle movement. Smith-Whitley et al. '083 does not have two actuators located on the right

and left backside of the torso. The first actuator, 22, actuates the spleen 18 and lung, for the spleen to inflate to indicate an extended spleen. The second actuator, 24, located in the head causes the doll's eyes to change color. Smith-Whitley et al. '083 does not teach either of the actuators providing modes for muscle movement. Therefore, the combination of Lampotang et al. '484 and Smith-Whitley et al. '083 would not teach the limitations of claim 7, and claim 7 is nonobvious.

Claim 8 depends from claim 7 and is therefore allowable with respect to claim 7.

**Rejection of claim 10 over Lampotang et al. (5,779,484) in view of Le Roy (4,003,141)**

The Examiner has rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lampotang et al. '484 in view of Le Roy '141.

Claim 10 is amended and requires air cushions arranged in at least one fontanelle area on the head of the simulator for swelling of the fontanelle area. A fontanelle area on a head is "a membrane-covered opening in bone or between bone" according to the *Merriam-Webster Dictionary* and the specification defines this region of the simulator head have skin that can move outwards when the air cushion is inflated and that the swelling in the head will "feel soft and yielding, as will be the case with a real patient." LeRoy '141 teaches a pressure measuring device for a skull where the outer layer, 18, is a plastic material, which is firm and non-yielding. The Examiner states that an abnormal pressure-creating means, element 30, in at least one fontanelle area is present in LeRoy '141. LeRoy '141 teaches a pressure creating means 30, but element 30 is located adjacent to the dura membrane and underneath the firm plastic outer layer 18. Additionally, LeRoy '141 makes no mention of fontanelle regions in his head. Therefore, the combination of LeRoy '141 and Lampotang et al. '484 would not teach an air cushion in a fontanelle region of the simulator head, and claim 10 as amended is nonobvious.

***New Claims***

New claims 11-14 have been added which are novel and nonobvious over Lampotang et al. (5,779,484), LeRoy (4,003,141), Owen et al. (6,910,896), and Smith-Whitley et al. (6,077,083).

***Conclusion***

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully asserts that the application is in condition for allowance, which allowance is hereby respectfully requested.

The Petition fee of \$460 is being charged to Deposit Account No. 02-3978 via electronic authorization submitted concurrently herewith. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments as a result of the filing of this paper to Deposit Account No. 02-3978.

Respectfully submitted,

**OYSTEIN GOMO**

By: /John E. Nemazi/  
John E. Nemazi  
Reg. No. 30,876  
Attorneys for Applicant

Dated: September 29, 2008

**BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.**  
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor  
Southfield, MI 48075-1238  
Phone: 248-358-4400  
Fax: 248-358-3351